

II. Remarks

Examination of this application in view of the above amendment and the following remarks is herein respectfully requested.

A. *Election/Restriction*

The Office Action acknowledges Applicants' previous election of Species B, represented by FIGS. 1, 4, and 5, in which previously presented claims 1-6, 27, and 28 were believed to be readable upon the elected species. However, the Office Action states "the elected embodiment does not have the straight flanks adjacent the thread edge as claimed in claim 5. Therefore claim 5 is also non-elected. In fact, there does not appear to be a drawing corresponding to the embodiment of claim 5." Applicants respectfully disagree.

Applicants submit that at least FIGS. 4, 8, and 10 illustrate that the flanks 15 and 16 clearly extend straight in their radially outer end regions adjoining the outer thread edge 14. The lines corresponding to apex angle α form straight lines together with the outer areas of the flanks 15 and 16, which can be easily ascertained with a ruler or the like. See also specification Pars. [0036] and [0037]. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 5 reads on the elected embodiment.

B. *Allowable Subject Matter*

The Examiner's indication of the allowability of claim 4, if rewritten into independent form, including all of the limitations of any base and intervening

claims, is noted, with appreciation. In response, claim 4 has been rewritten in independent form, as represented by independent claim 1. Applicants note that independent claim 1 is readable upon the embodiments depicted in FIGS. 1, 4-7, and 10-15.

C. Claim Rejections

Claims 1-3, 6, and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,527,932 to Onasch. Claim 28 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Onasch in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,536,117 to Yamashiro. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the reasons set forth in the Office Action regarding the rejection of claims 1-3, 6, 27, and 28. Nonetheless, to advance prosecution of the subject patent application and in no way to be interpreted as acquiescence to the rejection, claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of previously presented claim 4, which the Examiner has found allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1, including all claims depending therefrom, are allowable.

D. Reconsideration of Non-Elected Claims

Claims 7-26 stand withdrawn from consideration as a result of the Restriction Requirements set forth in the Office Action dated 2 November 2009. However, since claims 7-26 depend or otherwise require the limitations of allowable claim 1, Applicants respectfully request rejoinder and reconsideration of these claims. See, e.g., MPEP §§ 809 and 821.04.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present form of the claims are patentably distinguishable over the art of record and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 18, 2010

/Steven L. Oberholtzer/

Steven L. Oberholtzer

Reg. No.: 30,670

Attorney for Applicant(s)

(734) 302-6000